



67,036-003; B05541-AT1

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

Applicant: Beneditz  
Serial Number: 10/060,043  
Filed: 1/29/2002  
Group Art Unit: 2836  
Examiner: Rios Cuevas, Roberto Jose  
Title: POWER DISTRIBUTION ASSEMBLY  
WITH REDUNDANT ARCHITECTURE


Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**RESUBMISSION OF**  
**COMMENTS ON STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE**

Dear Sir:

On November 3, 2004, applicant submitted a document entitled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance." This document is not reflected in PAIR as having been entered. Copies of facsimile confirmations are attached. In conjunction with the payment of the Issue Fee, applicant now resubmits the Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance and requests entry of the Comments.

Respectfully submitted,



Kerrie A. LaBa, Reg. No. 42,077  
Carlson, Gaskey & Olds  
400 W. Maple Road, Ste. 350  
Birmingham, MI 48009  
(248) 988-8360


Dated: November 30, 2004



67,036-003; B05541-AT1

**CERTIFICATE OF MAIL**

I hereby certify that the enclosed Resubmission is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail, postage prepaid, in an envelope addressed to Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on this 30<sup>th</sup> day of November, 2004.

  
Laura Combs



67,036-003; B05541-AT1

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

Applicant: Beneditz  
Serial Number: 10/060,043  
Filed: 1/29/2002  
Group Art Unit: 2836  
Examiner: Rios Cuevas, Roberto Jose  
Title: POWER DISTRIBUTION ASSEMBLY  
WITH REDUNDANT ARCHITECTURE

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**COMMENTS ON STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE**


Dear Sir:

In response to the Notice of Allowance and Fee(s) Due, dated October 29, 2004, Applicant makes the following remarks.

In the "Detailed Action" of the subject Notice of Allowance, the examiner states that Applicant's July 23, 2004 response consisted of "amending claim 2, submission of new Oath/Declaration and remarks related to rejection of claims." Applicant did not submit a new Oath/Declaration with the response of July 23, 2004. Instead, Applicant provided arguments detailing why the Oath/Declaration submitted with the original filing of the application was not defective. Thus, Applicant asserts that a new Oath/Declaration is not required, the original Oath Declaration is satisfactory, and that all objections to the Oath/Declaration have been overcome.

Applicant believes that no additional fees are necessary, however, the Commissioner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 50-1482 in the name of Carlson, Gaskey & Olds for any additional fees or credit the account for any overpayment.


Respectfully submitted,

  
Kerrie A. LaBa, Reg. No. 42,170  
Carlson, Gaskey & Olds  
400 W. Maple Road, Ste. 350  
Birmingham, MI 48009  
(248) 988-8360

Dated: November 3, 2004

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION UNDER 37 CFR 1.8

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the United States patent and Trademark Office, fax number (703) 872-9306, on November 4, 2004.

  
Laura Combs

N:\Clients\HAMILTON ILLINOIS\IP00003\Patent\Comments on Notice of Allowance.doc

\*\*\*\*\*  
\*\*\* TX REPORT \*\*\*  
\*\*\*\*\*



TRANSMISSION OK

JOB NO. 2714  
DESTINATION ADDRESS 17038729306  
PSWD/SUBADDRESS  
DESTINATION ID  
ST. TIME 11/04 10:07  
USAGE T 00 '39  
PGS. 2  
RESULT OK

67,036-003; B05541-AT1

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: Beneditz  
Serial Number: 10/060,043  
Filed: 1/29/2002  
Group Art Unit: 2836  
Examiner: Rios Cuevas, Roberto Jose  
Title: POWER DISTRIBUTION ASSEMBLY  
WITH REDUNDANT ARCHITECTURE

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

COMMENTS ON STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE

Dear Sir:

In response to the Notice of Allowance and Fee(s) Due, dated October 29, 2004,

Applicant makes the following remarks.

In the "Detailed Action" of the subject Notice of Allowance, the examiner states that

Applicant's July 23, 2004 response consisted of "amending claim 2, submission of new Oath/Declaration and remarks related to rejection of claims." Applicant did not submit a new



## Auto-Reply Facsimile Transmission



TO:

Fax Sender at 12489888363

Fax Information

Date Received:

11/4/2004 10:04:22 AM [Eastern Standard Time]

Total Pages:

2 (including cover page)

**ADVISORY:** This is an automatically generated return receipt confirmation of the facsimile transmission received by the Office. Please check to make sure that the number of pages listed as received in Total Pages above matches what was intended to be sent. Applicants are advised to retain this receipt in the unlikely event that proof of this facsimile transmission is necessary. Applicants are also advised to use the certificate of facsimile transmission procedures set forth in 37 CFR 1.8(a) and (b), 37 CFR 1.6(f). Trademark Applicants, also see the Trademark Manual of Examining Procedure (TMEP) section 306 et seq.

Received  
Cover  
Page  
=====>

11/04/2004 THU 10:07 FAX 12489888363 Carlson, Gaskey & Olds	4001/002
67.036-003; B05541-AT1	
<b><u>IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE</u></b>	
Applicant:	Benediz
Serial Number:	10/060,043
Filed:	1/29/2002
Group Art Unit:	2836
Examiner:	Rios Cuevas, Roberto Jose
Title:	POWER DISTRIBUTION ASSEMBLY WITH REDUNDANT ARCHITECTURE
Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450	
<b><u>COMMENTS ON STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE</u></b>	
Dear Sir:	
In response to the Notice of Allowance and Fee(s) Due, dated October 29, 2004, Applicant makes the following remarks.	
In the "Detailed Action" of the subject Notice of Allowance, the examiner states that Applicant's July 23, 2004 response consisted of "amending claim 2, submission of new Oath/Declaration and remarks related to rejection of claims." Applicant did not submit a new Oath/Declaration with the response of July 23, 2004. Instead, Applicant provided arguments detailing why the Oath/Declaration submitted with the original filing of the application was not defective. Thus, Applicant asserts that a new Oath/Declaration is not required, the original Oath Declaration is satisfactory, and that all objections to the Oath/Declaration have been overcome.	